
**2003-2004 No Child Left Behind—Blue Ribbon Schools Program
Cover Sheet**

Name of Principal Mrs. Pamela F. Brown
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other) (As it should appear in the official records)

Official School Name Frank Crawford Martin Elementary School
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 14250 Boggs Drive
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)

Miami Florida 33176 - 6425
City State Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

Tel. (305) 238-3688 Fax (305) 232-4068

Website/URL http://: fcmartin.dadeschools.net E-mail pbrown@dadeschools.net

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

(Principal's Signature) Date February 4, 2004

Name of Superintendent* Mr. Merrett Stierheim
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Miami-Dade County Public Schools Tel. (305) 995-1000

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

(Superintendent's Signature) Date _____

Name of School Board President/Chairperson Dr. Michael Krop
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

I have reviewed the information in this package, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature) Date _____

**Private Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.*

PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

[Include this page in the school's application as page 2.]

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school has some configuration that includes grades K-12. (Schools with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has not been in school improvement status or been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's adequate yearly progress requirement in the 2003-2004 school year.
3. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, it has foreign language as a part of its core curriculum.
4. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 1998.
5. The nominated school or district is not refusing the OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
6. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if the OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
7. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school, or the school district as a whole, has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.
8. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

DISTRICT (Questions 1-2 not applicable to private schools)

- Number of schools in the district:

<u>203</u>	Elementary schools
<u>56</u>	Middle schools
<u>0</u>	Junior high schools
<u>35</u>	High schools
<u>54</u>	Other (28 Adult Centers, 5 Special Ed. Centers, 17 Alternative Ed. Centers, and 4 K-8 Schools)
<u>348</u>	TOTAL
- District Per Pupil Expenditure: \$5,858
 Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: \$6,187

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

- Category that best describes the area where the school is located:
 - Urban or large central city
 - Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban area
 - Suburban
 - Small city or town in a rural area
 - Rural
- 8 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.
 ____ If fewer than three years, how long was the previous principal at this school?
- Number of students enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total	Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
K	66	66	132	7	0	0	0
1	46	74	120	8	0	0	0
2	69	71	140	9	0	0	0
3	66	77	143	10	0	0	0
4	61	80	141	11	0	0	0
5	68	78	146	12	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	Other	0	0	0
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL →							822

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school:
- | | |
|-------------|----------------------------------|
| <u>20</u> | % White |
| <u>55</u> | % Black or African American |
| <u>21</u> | % Hispanic or Latino |
| <u>4</u> | % Asian/Pacific Islander |
| <u>0</u> | % American Indian/Alaskan Native |
| 100% | Total |

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 1.5 %

(This rate includes the total number of students who transferred to or from different schools between October 1 and the end of the school year, divided by the total number of students in the

(1)	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	3
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	10
(3)	Subtotal of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	13
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	825
(5)	Subtotal in row (3) divided by total in row (4)	0.0157
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	1.57

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 1.0%
7 Total Number Limited English Proficient
 Number of languages represented: 2
 Specify languages: Spanish and English

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 26%
216 Total Number Students Who Qualify

If this method does not produce a reasonably accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families or school does not participate in the federally-supported lunch program, specify a more accurate estimate, tell why the school chose it, and explain how it arrived at this estimate.

10. Students receiving special education services: 0.03 %
23 Total Number of Students Served

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

<u>0</u> Autism	<u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u>0</u> Deafness	<u>0</u> Other Health Impaired
<u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>3</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u>0</u> Hearing Impairment	<u>20</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u>0</u> Mental Retardation	<u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u>0</u> Multiple Disabilities	<u>0</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness

11. Indicate number of full-time and part-time staff members in each of the categories below:

	Number of Staff	
	<u>Full-time</u>	<u>Part-Time</u>
Administrator(s)	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
Classroom teachers	<u>49</u>	<u>1</u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>
Support staff	<u>12</u>	<u>19</u>
Total number	<u>63</u>	<u>25</u>

12. Average school student-“classroom teacher” ratio: 1:28

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. The student dropout rate is defined by the state. The student drop-off rate is the difference between the number of entering students and the number of exiting students from the same cohort. (From the same cohort, subtract the number of exiting students from the number of entering students; divide that number by the number of entering students; multiply by 100 to get the percentage drop-off rate.) Briefly explain in 100 words or fewer any major discrepancy between the dropout rate and the drop-off rate. (Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates and only high schools need to supply drop-off rates.)

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Daily student attendance	97.0	96.91	96.78	96.43	96.47
Daily teacher attendance	95.4	95.2	95.6	95.0	95.6
Teacher turnover rate	.04%	.08%	.5%	1%	2%
Student dropout rate	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Student drop-off rate	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

14. **(High Schools Only)** - Not applicable to Frank C. Martin Elementary School

Part III – Summary

Frank C. Martin Elementary School (FCMES) is a magnet school for students in grades 1-5 that provides the International Baccalaureate Organization's (IBO) Primary Years Programme (PYP). The school received official authorization from the IBO in the summer of 2000. The school also has a fee-based Pre-kindergarten as well as a Kindergarten program for the neighborhood children.

The PYP is an inquiry-based, comprehensive approach to teaching and learning that focuses on the development of the whole child. With an international focus, it addresses the academic, social, physical, emotional and cultural needs of the students.

While recognizing the importance of concepts, knowledge, and skills, the PYP believes that these alone do not make an internationally educated person. It is vital that we also focus on the development of positive "Attitudes" toward people, towards the environment, and towards learning. These attitudes are reflected in the vision of FCMES, which states: "Frank C. Martin Elementary School provides students with an internationally recognized curriculum. This curriculum incorporates world-class standards that empower students to actively participate in the learning process and acquire and exhibit positive attitudes. Students are enabled to become model citizens of our diverse world." PYP attitudes include: Appreciation, Commitment, Confidence, Cooperation, Creativity, Curiosity, Empathy, Enthusiasm, Independence, Integrity, Respect, and Tolerance.

The PYP is a concept-driven curriculum with the understanding that socially responsible actions are an integral part of the learning process. This is reflected in the school's mission, which is to create a supportive, creative, and flexible environment where children learn to think compassionately and think to learn globally. Instructional delivery methods include inquiry-based teaching and learning, computer-based instruction, direct instruction and reciprocal teaching. In addition, pre-kindergarten and kindergarten classes offer a curriculum based on the Florida Sunshine State Standards (SSS) and the Miami-Dade County Public Schools' (MDCPS) Competency-Based Curriculum (CBC).

The PYP Units of Inquiry, designed within the structure of the IBO's Organizing Themes provide the structure for the school's framework of content, and are designed by Grade Level teams/departments through collaborative planning. Curriculum for the PYP is organized into three main components: objectives, application, and effective assessment. The PYP Curriculum Components answer three core questions: What do we want to learn?; this is the written curriculum and the identification of student learning within a curriculum framework. How best will we learn?; this is the taught curriculum, the theory, and application of good instructional practices. And finally, How will we know what we have learned?; this is the learned curriculum, the theory, and application of effective assessment.

Ultimately, the PYP student has the attributes and dispositions in the IBO Student Profile. PYP students are : Inquirers, Thinkers, Communicators, Knowledgeable, Principled, Open-minded, Caring, Well-Balanced, and Reflective.

Part IV – Indicators of Academic Success

1. The Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) is part of Florida's effort to assess teaching and learning of high educational standards. The primary purpose of the FCAT is to assess students' achievement of higher-order cognitive skills delineated in the Sunshine State Standards (SSS) in reading, writing, mathematics, and science. The SSS portion of FCAT is a criterion-referenced test that measures the SSS benchmarks set forth by the Florida State Board of Education. The FCAT SSS assessment includes performance-based items in grades 4, 5, 8, and 10, which require students to provide a written response or explain a solution to a mathematical problem. Florida's accountability system is based on the scores from the FCAT SSS. A secondary purpose is to compare the performance of Florida students to the reading and mathematics performance of students across the nation using a norm-referenced test (NRT). Each spring, students in grades 3-10 take the FCAT NRT (Stanford Achievement Test, 9th Edition) in reading and mathematics. Additionally, all students in grade 2 take the Grade 2 Stanford Achievement Test, 9th Edition as part of Miami-Dade County Public Schools' (MDCPS) requirements.

Reading Highlights:

- FCMES continually achieves high standards in the percent of students scoring in the proficient and advanced levels. In 2002-2003, FCMES had over 50 percent of students scoring in the proficient and above level in most grade levels and subgroups.
- FCMES has had less than 5 percent of its students scoring in the lowest performance level for the past 3 years on the FCAT SSS. The State of Florida and District percents range from 20 to 50 percent.
- FCMES continually improves the performance of subgroups in reading. Over 50 percent of Black, Hispanic, and White students scored at or above the proficient level in grade 3 and 4.
- FCMES only had two students in grade 3 who did not meet the State's proficiency requirement and were referred for retention. MDCPS had 6,622 students who did not meet this proficiency level.
- FCMES has scored over the national median on the NRT for the past 5 years, and less than 5 percent of the students have scored in the lowest quartile range. FCMES has exceeded the State's and District's median percentile by over 15 percentile points in each grade level for over 5 years.

Mathematics Highlights:

- FCMES continuously achieves high standards in the percent of students scoring in the proficient and advanced levels. In 2002-2003, FCMES had over 30 percent of students score in the proficient and above level in the majority of grade levels and subgroups.
- FCMES has had less than 5 percent of its students scoring in the lowest performance level for the past 3 years on the FCAT SSS. The State of Florida and District percents range from 20 to 50 percent.
- FCMES has earned median percentiles ranging from 70 to 90 on the FCAT NRT for 5 years, and less than 5 percent of students scored in the lowest quartile range. FCMES has exceeded the State's and District's median percentile by over 15 percentile points at every grade level for over 5 years.
- FCMES has increased or maintained the median percentile scores of the majority of the subgroups on the FCAT NRT over the past 5 years.

2. Several systems are in place to review student assessment and make the necessary curricular and instructional adjustments. These systems include the EESAC (Educational Excellence School Advisory Council), which reviews assessment data annually, identifies areas of strength, and develops a plan to address the weaknesses. This committee, which is comprised of parents, teachers, administrators, students, and community members, meets regularly to make decisions concerning every aspect of the school and its operation. Based on assessment data, the committee may fund tutoring, instructional materials, and personnel to work directly with students at risk. A school-wide Assessment Committee meets regularly to review assessment data, as well as develop authentic assessment tools, such as rubrics, performance tasks, and portfolios. FCMES has also initiated a Faculty and Staff Mentoring Program for students at risk. Assessment data from state-mandated examinations is reviewed annually. At this time, the students in the lowest performance level are matched with faculty and staff volunteers who serve as mentors, providing motivation, as well as assistance in the areas of need. Students also utilized assessment data to understand and improve their own performance at school. Students quarterly review their work and analyze their areas of strength and challenge. Based on this reflection, students set short and long term goals for themselves. This empowers the students and reinforces the fact that they are active participants in their academic success. All of the stakeholders at FCMES continually reflect upon assessment data and its implications, in order to improve student and school performance.

3. FCMES regularly communicates student performance, including assessment data to parents, students, and the community at large. The EESAC officially receives assessment data from our school District. It then disseminates this information to the faculty, staff, parents, students, and members of the community via Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) general meetings, EESAC meetings, which are open to the public, electronic mail, newsletters, and even through community newspapers. The EESAC also makes this data available to all stakeholders within its official School Performance Excellence Plan (SPEP). This document summarizes the school's performance and delineates the educational goals set for the current school year. FCMES also hosts an annual Curriculum Night. Parents and family members attend workshops that keep them informed of our school's assessment results and challenging curriculum. At this time, families are provided with strategies for motivating and helping their children succeed, as well as information concerning educational initiatives in our Region, District, and State. Families also receive individual assessment results including students' individual scores, report cards, progress reports, and reflections on the development of character and values. At FCMES, students are also empowered to communicate their own performance to their families. Student-Led Portfolio Conferences are scheduled in the Fall, providing students the opportunity to discuss their progress with their parents. Here, students and their families review student work samples, reflect upon strengths and challenges, as well as set short and long term learning goals. Follow-up conferences are conducted at home two more times throughout the school year.

4. FCMES regularly shares its successes with other schools. Administrators and faculty participate in numerous professional development opportunities, especially those hosted by the IBO. Teachers and administrators are able to network with teachers from around the world, share successes, and collaborate on plans for improving student performance. Faculty and administrators have traveled within the state and throughout the country to attend seminars and networking opportunities. The principal also shares the school's successes with educators from around the world at bi-annual meetings of the IBO Curriculum Committee in Cardiff, Wales. FCMES teachers visit other schools to collaborate and share ideas. FCMES serves as an outstanding example for other schools within the District, as well as throughout the nation. Other schools often visit in order to gain insight into the instructional practices that make FCMES successful. Teachers, staff, administrators, and students collaborate with other elementary and middle schools, modeling transdisciplinary inquiry-based instructional and learning practices. Workshops hosted by the District provide teachers opportunities to share successes, as well as obtain strategies from educators from other schools. Forging bonds between schools fosters the sharing of ideas and communication of instructional best practices which leads to student success.

Part V – Curriculum and Instruction

1. Miami-Dade County Public School’s (MDCPS) Competency-Based Curriculum (CBC) and Florida’s Sunshine State Standards (SSS) provide the basic scope and sequence for the PYP’s instructional framework at FCMES. Due to the nature of the PYP and the required curriculum writing to address its framework and guidelines, our faculty has created a kindergarten through grade five transdisciplinary instructional matrix. Guided by a series of concept-driven questions and themes, students and teachers develop units for exploration and study. Each grade level completes six units addressing each of the six organizing themes – Who we are; Where we are in place and time; How we express ourselves; How the world works; How we organize ourselves; and Sharing the planet. Each grade level repeats these themes, but with a different, higher level central idea, thereby ensuring that main idea may be explored as broadly and extensively as the teacher and students wish. This also guarantees that the central idea will not be repeated in subsequent years. For instance, the theme, “Sharing the Planet” begins with the Kindergarten central idea “Living things grow and change.” In fourth grade, this same theme has the central ideas “In order to maintain a balance in nature, man is responsible for preserving our world’s ecosystems.”

In grade five, students are responsible for their own independent personal project, which becomes part of the culminating activity for their PYP career – the PYP Exhibition. This project is designed to demonstrate students’ proficiencies in all areas of the PYP (knowledge, concepts, skills, attitudes, and action).

While following the SSS, our reading and language arts program surpasses the expectations of Florida State standards. This is achieved by incorporating the use of novels, which allows students to advance at their own rate of learning. Quality literature is experienced through the Junior Great Books series, as well.

FCMES’ selection of the Everyday Mathematics series has enabled the academic program at the school to maintain its high standards and allow students to inquire about the “culture” of mathematics. Through the use of a spiraling curriculum, students practice previously learned skills on a daily basis, while being exposed to more challenging mathematical concepts. Mathematics and science are integrated in order to reinforce the idea that math is the language of science. The science curriculum has been developed to facilitate the inquiry-based, hands-on methodology and allow students to take responsibility for their own learning.

In the spirit of internationalism, students are required to learn a second language (either French or Spanish). Miami-Dade County Public School’s CBC provides the basic scope and sequence for the foreign language program. The major goals are to develop proficiency in the four language skills: speaking, listening, reading, and writing. Students are also exposed to the culture and traditions of the target countries where French and Spanish are spoken. The program also addresses the maintenance of language skills of students who are native speakers. Daily classes, which are fifty minutes in duration, are conducted in the foreign language.

The special area classes, including Art, Music, and Physical Education are committed to giving each student skills that may be utilized in everyday life, while increasing their appreciation for cultural experiences. Students are able to express their creativity beyond one-dimensional instruction. These special areas conform to MDCPS’ CBC and Florida’s SSS. In addition, Art, Music, and Physical Education, as well as French and Spanish, are integrated into the program of inquiry to form a cohesive, meaningful whole, thereby enhancing the school’s transdisciplinary approach to learning.

2. The English language curriculum implemented at FCMES is a balanced literacy program that develops thoughtful, independent, successful readers and lovers of learning. It emphasizes several premises: integrating new information with prior knowledge is key to comprehension, successful readers actively make sense from reading, conversations about what is learned are crucial, and communicating what students know and are learning is a vehicle for learning and thinking. The acquisition of literacy is a continuous process that is nurtured through direct instruction in a supportive environment. Students come to value reading and writing as natural extensions of their world. FCMES students hear a variety of rich literature read aloud, independently in school and at home, respond to literature through writing, active discussions, and role-playing, read and write for different purposes, and receive guided reading. All teachers have been trained in CRISS, use of Junior Great Books, Reciprocal Teaching, and Socratic questioning through Paideia Seminars. This empowers, not only the English language teacher, but all of the students' teachers, to in turn empower the students with rich literature, critical thinking, and discussion skills applied throughout the disciplines. A wealth of materials are used throughout the grade levels, including reading textbooks, novels, Junior Great Books, poetry, non-fiction trade books, and music in order to expose students to various genre and sources of information. FCMES is committed to the literacy and acquisition of knowledge of all students, therefore, improving the reading skills of students who read below grade level is critical. The school provides Saturday School (intensive three-hour small group instruction to empower students with reading skills) for third, fourth, and fifth graders, as well as regular small-group instruction and tutoring for students at risk in grades K through 5. Faculty and Staff mentors also work with these children, motivating them and assisting them in areas of need.

3. The mathematics curriculum implemented at FCMES is Everyday Mathematics, developed by the University of Chicago. This is a research-based mathematics program that led to the NCTM standards and consensus. This consensus emerged among mathematics educators about how best to teach mathematics to children. This program includes instruction, curricula, and tests that place a greater emphasis on problem-solving, application, and more complex mathematical topics at earlier grades. Everyday Mathematics provides a balanced approach to learning mathematics, in which computation skills, conceptual understanding, and reasoning develop together during meaningful activities that emphasize problem solving and real-life applications. Everyday Mathematics is based on how children learn, what they are interested in, and the future for which they must be prepared. The PYP methodology of teaching and learning is compatible with Everyday Mathematics because instruction is built on prior knowledge and everyday experiences. The PYP also believes that students construct their own knowledge, although the teacher is vitally important in providing a guide for learning important mathematics. The teacher's responsibility is to identify the students' prior knowledge, provide appropriate experiences, assess students' new learning, and begin the cycle again. In using this program and approach to learning mathematics, FCMES' test scores have consistently been the highest in the District overall and among the top twenty schools in the State for mathematics on the fifth grade FCAT.

4. FCMES uses a variety of instructional methods to enhance and improve student learning. The principal method used is inquiry-based instruction. This method is committed to the principle that structured, purposeful inquiry is a powerful vehicle for real learning, learning which promotes genuine understanding and which challenges the students to engage with important ideas. Student and teacher questions shape the unit, giving it direction and purpose. To encourage active learning for both students and teachers, the Paideia Method is also implemented in all areas of the curriculum. The three types of teaching and learning are: Socratic teaching for understanding, coaching for the development of skills, and didactic instruction for recall of important facts. The Paideia and PYP philosophy are a natural fit in that both instructional methods foster the belief that all children can learn. Teachers have also been trained to use CRISS (Creating Independence through Student-owned Strategies) activities promote thoughtful and independent readers and learners. CRISS also promotes better understanding through the writing process. Students write across the curriculum to organize information and ideas. Writing helps students become metacognitive and write about what they know. To provide for students with different learning styles and rates, FCMES provides support through

before and after-school tutoring, Saturday School, parent volunteer assistance, computer-assisted instruction, mentors, and paraprofessional small group instruction.

5. The professional development program at FCMES supports what is important to the school and its stakeholders. Each faculty member completes a Professional Development Plan (PDP) each fall to support the School Performance Excellence Plan (SPEP), its goals, and school-wide initiatives. Training is provided on campus, as well as in District offices and selected IBO PYP locations. Professional development supports the growth of knowledge, skills, and capabilities, which impact student achievement. For example, during the 2002-2003 school year, 100 percent of reading and language arts teachers participated in a variety of reading “Best Practices” training. These were assigned according to grade level needs and teacher PDPs. Additionally, 100 percent of teachers of mathematics and science participated in inquiry-based math and science workshops. MCDPS Teacher Education Center (TEC) also offers professional development for all teachers. Courses are available on-line as well as at a variety of school sites. Faculty members are also encouraged to pursue higher education degrees and specialized certificates through TEC and cooperating universities. In addition, faculty mentors assist each other in pursuing National Board Certification. Currently, five teachers are board certified. FCMES monitors educational and developmental needs by gathering input from personnel through needs’ assessment surveys and analysis of benchmarks and standardized test scores.

Part VI – Private School Addendum -

* This section is not applicable to our school.

PartVII – Assessment Results

* Please see attached data tables

STATE CRITERION REFERENCED TESTS
READING COMPREHENSION

Grade 3 Test Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test

Edition/publication year 1989 Publisher State of Florida

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 143

Number of students in who took the test 143

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none

Number excluded 0 Percent excluded 0

Testing Month	March	2002- 2003	2001- 2002	2000- 2001	1999- 2000	1998- 1999
SCHOOL SCORES						
	% At or Above Basic	92	90	87		
	% At or Above Proficient	60	57	47		
	% At Advanced	20	12	9		
	Number of Students Tested	143	146	136		
	Percent of Total Students Tested	100	100	100		
	Number of Students Excluded	0	0	0		
	Percent of Students Excluded	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1. White						
	% At or Above Basic	93	93	92		
	% At or Above Proficient	64	73	62		
	% At Advanced	27	27	11		
	Number of Students Tested	41	41	37		
2. Black						
	% At or Above Basic	88	86	78		
	% At or Above Proficient	59	41	22		
	% At Advanced	18	8	0		
	Number of Students Tested	35	36	44		
3. Hispanic						
	% At or Above Basic	94	92	86		
	% At or Above Proficient	50	48	48		
	% At Advanced	17	6	14		
	Number of Students Tested	35	36	44		
STATE SCORES						
	% At or Above Basic	63	60	53		
	State Mean Score					
	% At or Above Proficient	30	28	25		
	State Mean Score					
	% At Advanced	5	5	7		
	State Mean Score					

STATE CRITERION REFERENCED TESTS
READING COMPREHENSION

Grade 4 Test Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test

Edition/publication year 1989 Publisher State of Florida

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 148

Number of students in who took the test 148

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none

Number excluded 0 Percent excluded 0

Testing Month	March	2002- 2003	2001- 2002	2000- 2001	1999- 2000	1998- 1999
SCHOOL SCORES						
	% At or Above Basic	93	88	82		
	% At or Above Proficient	65	57	48		
	% At Advanced	23	9	15		
	Number of Students Tested	148	140	108		
	Percent of Total Students Tested	100	100	100		
	Number of Students Excluded	0	0	0		
	Percent of Students Excluded	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1. White						
	% At or Above Basic	92	95	94		
	% At or Above Proficient	80	70	75		
	% At Advanced	26	19	34		
	Number of Students Tested	39	37	32		
2. Black						
	% At or Above Basic	91	79	66		
	% At or Above Proficient	59	38	23		
	% At Advanced	4	5	6		
	Number of Students Tested	47	43	35		
3. Hispanic						
	% At or Above Basic	93	89	86		
	% At or Above Proficient	61	53	42		
	% At Advanced	33	4	6		
	Number of Students Tested	40	45	36		
STATE SCORES						
	% At or Above Basic	60	55	53		
	State Mean Score					
	% At or Above Proficient	29	27	25		
	State Mean Score					
	% At Advanced	6	6	7		
	State Mean Score					

STATE CRITERION REFERENCED TESTS
MATHEMATICS

Grade 3 Test Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test

Edition/publication year 1989 Publisher State of Florida

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 143

Number of students in who took the test 143

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none

Number excluded 0 Percent excluded 0

Testing Month	March	2002- 2003	2001- 2002	2000- 2001	1999- 2000	1998- 1999
SCHOOL SCORES						
	% At or Above Basic	92	91	82		
	% At or Above Proficient	71	57	45		
	% At Advanced	33	16	10		
	Number of Students Tested	143	147	136		
	Percent of Total Students Tested	100	100	100		
	Number of Students Excluded	0	0	0		
	Percent of Students Excluded	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1. White						
	% At or Above Basic	90	95	92		
	% At or Above Proficient	64	76	57		
	% At Advanced	32	27	14		
	Number of Students Tested	41	41	37		
2. Black						
	% At or Above Basic	91	86	73		
	% At or Above Proficient	47	34	24		
	% At Advanced	11	4	0		
	Number of Students Tested	56	50	41		
3. Hispanic						
	% At or Above Basic	94	92	80		
	% At or Above Proficient	49	52	46		
	% At Advanced	26	8	14		
	Number of Students Tested	35	36	44		
STATE SCORES						
	% At or Above Basic	63	59	48		
	State Mean Score					
	% At or Above Proficient	29	25	26		
	State Mean Score					
	% At Advanced	7	5	6		
	State Mean Score					

STATE CRITERION REFERENCED TESTS
MATHEMATICS

Grade 4 Test Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test

Edition/publication year 1989 Publisher State of Florida

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 148

Number of students in who took the test 148

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none

Number excluded 0 Percent excluded 0

Testing Month	March	2002- 2003	2001- 2002	2000- 2001	1999- 2000	1998- 1999
SCHOOL SCORES						
	% At or Above Basic	90	86	84		
	% At or Above Proficient	46	43	49		
	% At Advanced	14	13	17		
	Number of Students Tested	148	140	108		
	Percent of Total Students Tested	100	100	100		
	Number of Students Excluded	0	0	0		
	Percent of Students Excluded	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1. White						
	% At or Above Basic	95	100	97		
	% At or Above Proficient	61	78	62		
	% At Advanced	23	24	34		
	Number of Students Tested	39	37	32		
2. Black						
	% At or Above Basic	81	67	66		
	% At or Above Proficient	28	23	29		
	% At Advanced	2	2	9		
	Number of Students Tested	47	43	35		
3. Hispanic						
	% At or Above Basic	90	89	92		
	% At or Above Proficient	38	51	53		
	% At Advanced	13	11	11		
	Number of Students Tested	40	45	36		
STATE SCORES						
	% At or Above Basic	54	51	48		
	State Mean Score					
	% At or Above Proficient	20	19	26		
	State Mean Score					
	% At Advanced	4	4	6		
	State Mean Score					

STATE CRITERION REFERENCED TESTS
READING COMPREHENSION

Grade 5 Test Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test

Edition/publication year 1989 Publisher State of Florida

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 131

Number of students in who took the test 131

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none

Number excluded 0 Percent excluded 0

Testing Month	March	2002- 2003	2001- 2002	2000- 2001	1999- 2000	1998- 1999
SCHOOL SCORES						
	% At or Above Basic	86	92	80		
	% At or Above Proficient	48	57	49		
	% At Advanced	10	17	12		
	Number of Students Tested	131	103	104		
	Percent of Total Students Tested	100	100	100		
	Number of Students Excluded	0	0	0		
	Percent of Students Excluded	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1. White						
	% At or Above Basic	94	97	96		
	% At or Above Proficient	64	77	72		
	% At Advanced	17	30	18		
	Number of Students Tested	36	30	28		
2. Black						
	% At or Above Basic	73	83	59		
	% At or Above Proficient	24	38	21		
	% At Advanced	2	9	3		
	Number of Students Tested	41	35	34		
3. Hispanic						
	% At or Above Basic	90	97	84		
	% At or Above Proficient	51	51	49		
	% At Advanced	15	12	14		
	Number of Students Tested	39	33	37		
STATE SCORES						
	% At or Above Basic	58	53	53		
	State Mean Score					
	% At or Above Proficient	25	23	25		
	State Mean Score					
	% At Advanced	4	4	7		
	State Mean Score					

STATE CRITERION REFERENCED TESTS
MATHEMATICS

Grade 5 Test Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test

Edition/publication year 1989 Publisher State of Florida

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 131

Number of students in who took the test 131

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none

Number excluded 0 Percent excluded 0

Testing Month	March	2002- 2003	2001- 2002	2000- 2001	1999- 2000	1998- 1999
SCHOOL SCORES						
	% At or Above Basic	92	94	87		
	% At or Above Proficient	67	74	68		
	% At Advanced	27	36	23		
	Number of Students Tested	131	103	103		
	Percent of Total Students Tested	100	100	100		
	Number of Students Excluded	0	0	0		
	Percent of Students Excluded	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1. White						
	% At or Above Basic	100	100	96		
	% At or Above Proficient	67	90	93		
	% At Advanced	42	53	43		
	Number of Students Tested	36	30	28		
2. Black						
	% At or Above Basic	85	86	76		
	% At or Above Proficient	53	45	41		
	% At Advanced	2	14	9		
	Number of Students Tested	41	35	34		
3. Hispanic						
	% At or Above Basic	92	97	89		
	% At or Above Proficient	75	87	72		
	% At Advanced	31	39	25		
	Number of Students Tested	39	33	36		
STATE SCORES						
	% At or Above Basic	52	48	48		
	State Mean Score					
	% At or Above Proficient	28	25	26		
	State Mean Score					
	% At Advanced	7	6	6		
	State Mean Score					

Displaying Assessments Referenced Against National Norms
READING COMPREHENSION

Grade 2 Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/publication year 9TH/1997 Publisher Harcourt Brace Educational Measurement

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 148

Number of students in who took the test 148

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled Scores Percentiles (Median)

Testing Month	March	2002- 2003	2001- 2002	2000- 2001	1999- 2000	1998- 1999
SCHOOL SCORES						
Total Score		85	83	82	83	71
Number of Students Tested		148	135	128	129	90
Percent of Total Students Tested		100	100	100	100	100
Number of Students Excluded		0	0	0	0	0
Percent of Students Excluded		0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1. White		91	88	88	87	79
Number of Students Tested		37	41	37	34	24
2. Black		77	80	78	69	64
Number of Students Tested		55	50	40	42	37
3. Hispanic		88	80	79	85	71
Number of Students Tested		30	31	33	39	27
4. Female		88	85	82	85	68
Number of Students Tested		75	82	68	71	61
5. Male		85	83	82	82	71
Number of Students Tested		73	53	60	58	29

Displaying Assessments Referenced Against National Norms
MATHEMATICS

Grade 2 Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/publication year 9TH/1997 Publisher Harcourt Brace Educational Measurement

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 148

Number of students in who took the test 148

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled Scores Percentiles (Median)

Testing Month	March	2002- 2003	2001- 2002	2000- 2001	1999- 2000	1998- 1999
SCHOOL SCORES						
	Total Score	83	90	82	83	80
	Number of Students Tested	148	135	128	129	90
	Percent of Total Students Tested	100	100	100	100	100
	Number of Students Excluded	0	0	0	0	0
	Percent of Students Excluded	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1. White		86	93	86	92	88
	Number of Students Tested	37	41	37	34	24
2. Black		71	86	78	69	63
	Number of Students Tested	55	50	40	42	37
3. Hispanic		83	83	82	79	74
	Number of Students Tested	30	31	33	39	27
4. Female		79	86	82	86	80
	Number of Students Tested	75	82	68	71	61
5. Male		90	90	86	88	88
	Number of Students Tested	73	53	60	58	29

Displaying Assessments Referenced Against National Norms
MATHEMATICS

Grade 3 Test Stanford Achievement Test
 Edition/publication year 9TH/1997 Publisher Harcourt Brace Educational Measurement
 Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 141
 Number of students in who took the test 141
 What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled Scores Percentiles X (Median)

Testing Month	March	2002- 2003	2001- 2002	2000- 2001	1999- 2000	1998- 1999
SCHOOL SCORES						
Total Score		86	83	83	83	73
Number of Students Tested		141	147	135	99	107
Percent of Total Students Tested		100	100	100	100	100
Number of Students Excluded		0	0	0	0	0
Percent of Students Excluded		0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1. White		91	83	91	87	84
Number of Students Tested		40	41	37	31	27
2. Black		85	74	64	68	57
Number of Students Tested		56	50	41	30	43
3. Hispanic		78	83	83	81	80
Number of Students Tested		34	36	43	36	32
4. Female		86	83	81	79	69
Number of Students Tested		52	80	74	66	60
5. Male		83	86	86	87	80
Number of Students Tested		89	67	61	33	47

Displaying Assessments Referenced Against National Norms
READING COMPREHENSION

Grade 3 Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/publication year 9TH/1997 Publisher Harcourt Brace Educational Measurement

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 141

Number of students in who took the test 141

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled Scores Percentiles X (Median)

Testing Month	March	2002- 2003	2001- 2002	2000- 2001	1999- 2000	1998- 1999
SCHOOL SCORES						
Total Score		84	75	75	75	55
Number of Students Tested		141	147	135	99	107
Percent of Total Students Tested		100	100	100	100	100
Number of Students Excluded		0	0	0	0	0
Percent of Students Excluded		0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1. White		90	88	84	81	66
Number of Students Tested		40	41	37	31	27
2. Black		83	72	62	59	42
Number of Students Tested		56	50	41	30	43
3. Hispanic		81	74	64	75	62
Number of Students Tested		34	36	43	36	32
4. Female		81	75	71	73	60
Number of Students Tested		89	80	74	66	60
5. Male		86	78	75	75	50
Number of Students Tested		52	67	61	33	47

Displaying Assessments Referenced Against National Norms
MATHEMATICS

Grade 4 Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/publication year 9TH/1997 Publisher Harcourt Brace Educational Measurement

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 145

Number of students in who took the test 145

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled Scores Percentiles (Median)

Testing Month	March	2002- 2003	2001- 2002	2000- 2001	1999- 2000	1998- 1999
SCHOOL SCORES						
Total Score		86	82	82	76	81
Number of Students Tested		145	139	107	105	89
Percent of Total Students Tested		100	100	100	100	100
Number of Students Excluded		0	0	0	0	0
Percent of Students Excluded		0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1. White		89	89	92	85	85
Number of Students Tested		38	37	32	30	27
2. Black		78	70	67	65	77
Number of Students Tested		47	43	34	33	33
3. Hispanic		86	82	82	78	85
Number of Students Tested		38	44	36	36	21
4. Female		86	82	75	73	81
Number of Students Tested		79	83	69	62	51
5. Male		86	86	86	80	83
Number of Students Tested		66	56	38	43	38

Displaying Assessments Referenced Against National Norms
READING COMPREHENSION

Grade 4

Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/publication year 9TH/1997

Publisher Harcourt Brace Educational Measurement

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 145

Number of students in who took the test 145

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled Scores Percentiles (Median)

Testing Month	March	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
SCHOOL SCORES						
Total Score		81	79	81	70	80
Number of Students Tested		145	139	107	105	89
Percent of Total Students Tested		100	100	100	100	100
Number of Students Excluded		0	0	0	0	0
Percent of Students Excluded		0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1. White		88	85	91	81	84
	Number of Students Tested	38	37	32	30	27
2. Black		73	65	73	56	55
	Number of Students Tested	47	43	34	33	33
3. Hispanic		81	80	81	69	77
	Number of Students Tested	38	44	36	36	21
4. Female		79	79	79	70	80
	Number of Students Tested	79	83	69	62	51
5. Male		81	80	85	67	75
	Number of Students Tested	66	56	38	43	38

Displaying Assessments Referenced Against National Norms
READING COMPREHENSION

Grade 5 Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/publication year 9TH/1997 Publisher Harcourt Brace Educational Measurement

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 130

Number of students in who took the test 130

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled Scores Percentiles (Median)

Testing Month	March	2002- 2003	2001- 2002	2000- 2001	1999- 2000	1998- 1999
SCHOOL SCORES						
	Total Score	83	83	72	73	64
	Number of Students Tested	130	101	104	91	73
	Percent of Total Students Tested	100	100	100	100	100
	Number of Students Excluded	0	0	0	0	0
	Percent of Students Excluded	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1. White		83	89	82	80	72
	Number of Students Tested	36	30	28	29	14
2. Black		64	70	60	66	54
	Number of Students Tested	41	34	34	32	32
3. Hispanic		76	83	73	73	67
	Number of Students Tested	38	32	37	22	23
4. Female		76	83	72	73	64
	Number of Students Tested	77	64	66	55	49
5. Male		73	87	70	67	62
	Number of Students Tested	53	37	38	36	24

Displaying Assessments Referenced Against National Norms
READING COMPREHENSION

Grade 5 Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/publication year 9TH/1997 Publisher Harcourt Brace Educational Measurement

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 130

Number of students in who took the test 130

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled Scores Percentiles X (Median)

Testing Month	March	2002- 2003	2001- 2002	2000- 2001	1999- 2000	1998- 1999
SCHOOL SCORES						
	Total Score	83	87	87	78	76
	Number of Students Tested	130	101	104	91	73
	Percent of Total Students Tested	100	100	100	100	100
	Number of Students Excluded	0	0	0	0	0
	Percent of Students Excluded	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1. White		87	94	93	85	78
	Number of Students Tested	36	30	28	29	14
2. Black		79	79	73	67	71
	Number of Students Tested	41	34	34	32	32
3. Hispanic		83	87	87	81	73
	Number of Students Tested	38	32	37	22	23
4. Female		79	87	83	78	76
	Number of Students Tested	77	64	66	55	49
5. Male		93	91	91	81	79
	Number of Students Tested	53	37	38	36	24

STATE CRITERION REFERENCED TESTS
READING COMPREHENSION

Grade 3 Test Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test

Edition/publication year 1989 Publisher State of Florida

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 143

Number of students in who took the test 143

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none

Number excluded		<u> 0 </u>		Percent excluded		<u> 0 </u>	
Testing Month	March	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	
SCHOOL SCORES							
	% At or Above Basic	92	90	87			
	% At or Above Proficient	60	57	47			
	% At Advanced	20	12	9			
	Number of Students Tested	143	146	136			
	Percent of Total Students Tested	100	100	100			
	Number of Students Excluded	0	0	0			
	Percent of Students Excluded	0	0	0			
SUBGROUP SCORES							
1. White							
	% At or Above Basic	93	93	92			
	% At or Above Proficient	64	73	62			
	% At Advanced	27	27	11			
	Number of Students Tested	41	41	37			
2. Black							
	% At or Above Basic	88	86	78			
	% At or Above Proficient	59	41	22			
	% At Advanced	18	8	0			
	Number of Students Tested	35	36	44			
3. Hispanic							
	% At or Above Basic	94	92	86			
	% At or Above Proficient	50	48	48			
	% At Advanced	17	6	14			
	Number of Students Tested	35	36	44			
STATE SCORES							
	% At or Above Basic	63	60	53			
	State Mean Score						
	% At or Above Proficient	30	28	25			
	State Mean Score						
	% At Advanced	5	5	7			
	State Mean Score						

STATE CRITERION REFERENCED TESTS
READING COMPREHENSION

Grade 4 Test Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test

Edition/publication year 1989 Publisher State of Florida

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 148

Number of students in who took the test 148

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none

Number excluded 0 Percent excluded 0

Testing Month	March	2002- 2003	2001- 2002	2000- 2001	1999- 2000	1998- 1999
SCHOOL SCORES						
	% At or Above Basic	93	88	82		
	% At or Above Proficient	65	57	48		
	% At Advanced	23	9	15		
	Number of Students Tested	148	140	108		
	Percent of Total Students Tested	100	100	100		
	Number of Students Excluded	0	0	0		
	Percent of Students Excluded	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1. White						
	% At or Above Basic	92	95	94		
	% At or Above Proficient	80	70	75		
	% At Advanced	26	19	34		
	Number of Students Tested	39	37	32		
2. Black						
	% At or Above Basic	91	79	66		
	% At or Above Proficient	59	38	23		
	% At Advanced	4	5	6		
	Number of Students Tested	47	43	35		
3. Hispanic						
	% At or Above Basic	93	89	86		
	% At or Above Proficient	61	53	42		
	% At Advanced	33	4	6		
	Number of Students Tested	40	45	36		
STATE SCORES						
	% At or Above Basic	60	55	53		
	State Mean Score					
	% At or Above Proficient	29	27	25		
	State Mean Score					
	% At Advanced	6	6	7		
	State Mean Score					

STATE CRITERION REFERENCED TESTS
MATHEMATICS

Grade 3 Test Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test

Edition/publication year 1989 Publisher State of Florida

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 143

Number of students in who took the test 143

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none

Number excluded 0 Percent excluded 0

Testing Month	March	2002- 2003	2001- 2002	2000- 2001	1999- 2000	1998- 1999
SCHOOL SCORES						
	% At or Above Basic	92	91	82		
	% At or Above Proficient	71	57	45		
	% At Advanced	33	16	10		
	Number of Students Tested	143	147	136		
	Percent of Total Students Tested	100	100	100		
	Number of Students Excluded	0	0	0		
	Percent of Students Excluded	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1. White						
	% At or Above Basic	90	95	92		
	% At or Above Proficient	64	76	57		
	% At Advanced	32	27	14		
	Number of Students Tested	41	41	37		
2. Black						
	% At or Above Basic	91	86	73		
	% At or Above Proficient	47	34	24		
	% At Advanced	11	4	0		
	Number of Students Tested	56	50	41		
3. Hispanic						
	% At or Above Basic	94	92	80		
	% At or Above Proficient	49	52	46		
	% At Advanced	26	8	14		
	Number of Students Tested	35	36	44		
STATE SCORES						
	% At or Above Basic	63	59	48		
	State Mean Score					
	% At or Above Proficient	29	25	26		
	State Mean Score					
	% At Advanced	7	5	6		
	State Mean Score					

STATE CRITERION REFERENCED TESTS
MATHEMATICS

Grade 4 Test Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test

Edition/publication year 1989 Publisher State of Florida

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 148

Number of students in who took the test 148

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none

Number excluded		<u> 0 </u>		Percent excluded		<u> 0 </u>	
Testing Month	March	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	
SCHOOL SCORES							
	% At or Above Basic	90	86	84			
	% At or Above Proficient	46	43	49			
	% At Advanced	14	13	17			
	Number of Students Tested	148	140	108			
	Percent of Total Students Tested	100	100	100			
	Number of Students Excluded	0	0	0			
	Percent of Students Excluded	0	0	0			
SUBGROUP SCORES							
1. White							
	% At or Above Basic	95	100	97			
	% At or Above Proficient	61	78	62			
	% At Advanced	23	24	34			
	Number of Students Tested	39	37	32			
2. Black							
	% At or Above Basic	81	67	66			
	% At or Above Proficient	28	23	29			
	% At Advanced	2	2	9			
	Number of Students Tested	47	43	35			
3. Hispanic							
	% At or Above Basic	90	89	92			
	% At or Above Proficient	38	51	53			
	% At Advanced	13	11	11			
	Number of Students Tested	40	45	36			
STATE SCORES							
	% At or Above Basic	54	51	48			
	State Mean Score						
	% At or Above Proficient	20	19	26			
	State Mean Score						
	% At Advanced	4	4	6			
	State Mean Score						

STATE CRITERION REFERENCED TESTS
READING COMPREHENSION

Grade 5 Test Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test

Edition/publication year 1989 Publisher State of Florida

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 131

Number of students in who took the test 131

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none

Number excluded 0 Percent excluded 0

Testing Month	March	2002- 2003	2001- 2002	2000- 2001	1999- 2000	1998- 1999
SCHOOL SCORES						
	% At or Above Basic	86	92	80		
	% At or Above Proficient	48	57	49		
	% At Advanced	10	17	12		
	Number of Students Tested	131	103	104		
	Percent of Total Students Tested	100	100	100		
	Number of Students Excluded	0	0	0		
	Percent of Students Excluded	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1. White						
	% At or Above Basic	94	97	96		
	% At or Above Proficient	64	77	72		
	% At Advanced	17	30	18		
	Number of Students Tested	36	30	28		
2. Black						
	% At or Above Basic	73	83	59		
	% At or Above Proficient	24	38	21		
	% At Advanced	2	9	3		
	Number of Students Tested	41	35	34		
3. Hispanic						
	% At or Above Basic	90	97	84		
	% At or Above Proficient	51	51	49		
	% At Advanced	15	12	14		
	Number of Students Tested	39	33	37		
STATE SCORES						
	% At or Above Basic	58	53	53		
	State Mean Score					
	% At or Above Proficient	25	23	25		
	State Mean Score					
	% At Advanced	4	4	7		
	State Mean Score					

STATE CRITERION REFERENCED TESTS
MATHEMATICS

Grade 5 Test Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test
 Edition/publication year 1989 Publisher State of Florida
 Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 131
 Number of students in who took the test 131
 What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none

Number excluded		<u> 0 </u>		Percent excluded		<u> 0 </u>	
Testing Month	March	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	
SCHOOL SCORES							
	% At or Above Basic	92	94	87			
	% At or Above Proficient	67	74	68			
	% At Advanced	27	36	23			
	Number of Students Tested	131	103	103			
	Percent of Total Students Tested	100	100	100			
	Number of Students Excluded	0	0	0			
	Percent of Students Excluded	0	0	0			
SUBGROUP SCORES							
1. White							
	% At or Above Basic	100	100	96			
	% At or Above Proficient	67	90	93			
	% At Advanced	42	53	43			
	Number of Students Tested	36	30	28			
2. Black							
	% At or Above Basic	85	86	76			
	% At or Above Proficient	53	45	41			
	% At Advanced	2	14	9			
	Number of Students Tested	41	35	34			
3. Hispanic							
	% At or Above Basic	92	97	89			
	% At or Above Proficient	75	87	72			
	% At Advanced	31	39	25			
	Number of Students Tested	39	33	36			
STATE SCORES							
	% At or Above Basic	52	48	48			
	State Mean Score						
	% At or Above Proficient	28	25	26			
	State Mean Score						
	% At Advanced	7	6	6			
	State Mean Score						

Displaying Assessments Referenced Against National Norms
READING COMPREHENSION

Grade 2 Test Stanford Achievement Test
 Edition/publication year 9TH/1997 Publisher Harcourt Brace Educational Measurement
 Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 148
 Number of students in who took the test 148
 What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled Scores Percentiles X (Median)

Testing Month	March	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
SCHOOL SCORES						
	Total Score	85	83	82	83	71
	Number of Students Tested	148	135	128	129	90
	Percent of Total Students Tested	100	100	100	100	100
	Number of Students Excluded	0	0	0	0	0
	Percent of Students Excluded	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1. White		91	88	88	87	79
	Number of Students Tested	37	41	37	34	24
2. Black		77	80	78	69	64
	Number of Students Tested	55	50	40	42	37
3. Hispanic		88	80	79	85	71
	Number of Students Tested	30	31	33	39	27
4. Female		88	85	82	85	68
	Number of Students Tested	75	82	68	71	61
5. Male		85	83	82	82	71
	Number of Students Tested	73	53	60	58	29

Displaying Assessments Referenced Against National Norms
MATHEMATICS

Grade 2 Test Stanford Achievement Test
 Edition/publication year 9TH/1997 Publisher Harcourt Brace Educational Measurement
 Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 148
 Number of students in who took the test 148
 What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled Scores Percentiles X (Median)

Testing Month	March	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
SCHOOL SCORES						
Total Score		83	90	82	83	80
Number of Students Tested		148	135	128	129	90
Percent of Total Students Tested		100	100	100	100	100
Number of Students Excluded		0	0	0	0	0
Percent of Students Excluded		0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1. White		86	93	86	92	88
	Number of Students Tested	37	41	37	34	24
2. Black		71	86	78	69	63
	Number of Students Tested	55	50	40	42	37
3. Hispanic		83	83	82	79	74
	Number of Students Tested	30	31	33	39	27
4. Female		79	86	82	86	80
	Number of Students Tested	75	82	68	71	61
5. Male		90	90	86	88	88
	Number of Students Tested	73	53	60	58	29

Displaying Assessments Referenced Against National Norms
MATHEMATICS

Grade 3 Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/publication year 9TH/1997 Publisher Harcourt Brace Educational Measurement

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 141

Number of students in who took the test 141

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled Scores Percentiles X (Median)

Testing Month	March	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
SCHOOL SCORES						
	Total Score	86	83	83	83	73
	Number of Students Tested	141	147	135	99	107
	Percent of Total Students Tested	100	100	100	100	100
	Number of Students Excluded	0	0	0	0	0
	Percent of Students Excluded	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1. White		91	83	91	87	84
	Number of Students Tested	40	41	37	31	27
2. Black		85	74	64	68	57
	Number of Students Tested	56	50	41	30	43
3. Hispanic		78	83	83	81	80
	Number of Students Tested	34	36	43	36	32
4. Female		86	83	81	79	69
	Number of Students Tested	52	80	74	66	60
5. Male		83	86	86	87	80
	Number of Students Tested	89	67	61	33	47

Displaying Assessments Referenced Against National Norms
READING COMPREHENSION

Grade 3 Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/publication year 9TH/1997 Publisher Harcourt Brace Educational Measurement

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 141

Number of students in who took the test 141

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled Scores Percentiles X (Median)

Testing Month	March	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
SCHOOL SCORES						
	Total Score	84	75	75	75	55
	Number of Students Tested	141	147	135	99	107
	Percent of Total Students Tested	100	100	100	100	100
	Number of Students Excluded	0	0	0	0	0
	Percent of Students Excluded	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1. White		90	88	84	81	66
	Number of Students Tested	40	41	37	31	27
2. Black		83	72	62	59	42
	Number of Students Tested	56	50	41	30	43
3. Hispanic		81	74	64	75	62
	Number of Students Tested	34	36	43	36	32
4. Female		81	75	71	73	60
	Number of Students Tested	89	80	74	66	60
5. Male		86	78	75	75	50
	Number of Students Tested	52	67	61	33	47

Displaying Assessments Referenced Against National Norms
MATHEMATICS

Grade 4 Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/publication year 9TH/1997 Publisher Harcourt Brace Educational Measurement

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 145

Number of students in who took the test 145

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled Scores Percentiles (Median)

Testing Month	March	2002- 2003	2001- 2002	2000- 2001	1999- 2000	1998- 1999
SCHOOL SCORES						
Total Score		86	82	82	76	81
Number of Students Tested		145	139	107	105	89
Percent of Total Students Tested		100	100	100	100	100
Number of Students Excluded		0	0	0	0	0
Percent of Students Excluded		0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1. White		89	89	92	85	85
Number of Students Tested		38	37	32	30	27
2. Black		78	70	67	65	77
Number of Students Tested		47	43	34	33	33
3. Hispanic		86	82	82	78	85
Number of Students Tested		38	44	36	36	21
4. Female		86	82	75	73	81
Number of Students Tested		79	83	69	62	51
5. Male		86	86	86	80	83
Number of Students Tested		66	56	38	43	38

Displaying Assessments Referenced Against National Norms
READING COMPREHENSION

Grade 4 Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/publication year 9TH/1997 Publisher Harcourt Brace Educational Measurement

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 145

Number of students in who took the test 145

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled Scores Percentiles X (Median)

Testing Month	March	2002- 2003	2001- 2002	2000- 2001	1999- 2000	1998- 1999
SCHOOL SCORES						
	Total Score	81	79	81	70	80
	Number of Students Tested	145	139	107	105	89
	Percent of Total Students Tested	100	100	100	100	100
	Number of Students Excluded	0	0	0	0	0
	Percent of Students Excluded	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1. White		88	85	91	81	84
	Number of Students Tested	38	37	32	30	27
2. Black		73	65	73	56	55
	Number of Students Tested	47	43	34	33	33
3. Hispanic		81	80	81	69	77
	Number of Students Tested	38	44	36	36	21
4. Female		79	79	79	70	80
	Number of Students Tested	79	83	69	62	51
5. Male		81	80	85	67	75
	Number of Students Tested	66	56	38	43	38

Displaying Assessments Referenced Against National Norms
READING COMPREHENSION

Grade 5 Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/publication year 9TH/1997 Publisher Harcourt Brace Educational Measurement

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 130

Number of students in who took the test 130

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled Scores Percentiles (Median)

Testing Month	March	2002- 2003	2001- 2002	2000- 2001	1999- 2000	1998- 1999
SCHOOL SCORES						
	Total Score	83	83	72	73	64
	Number of Students Tested	130	101	104	91	73
	Percent of Total Students Tested	100	100	100	100	100
	Number of Students Excluded	0	0	0	0	0
	Percent of Students Excluded	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1. White		83	89	82	80	72
	Number of Students Tested	36	30	28	29	14
2. Black		64	70	60	66	54
	Number of Students Tested	41	34	34	32	32
3. Hispanic		76	83	73	73	67
	Number of Students Tested	38	32	37	22	23
4. Female		76	83	72	73	64
	Number of Students Tested	77	64	66	55	49
5. Male		73	87	70	67	62
	Number of Students Tested	53	37	38	36	24

Displaying Assessments Referenced Against National Norms
READING COMPREHENSION

Grade 5 Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/publication year 9TH/1997 Publisher Harcourt Brace Educational Measurement

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 130

Number of students in who took the test 130

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled Scores Percentiles X (Median)

Testing Month	March	2002- 2003	2001- 2002	2000- 2001	1999- 2000	1998- 1999
SCHOOL SCORES						
Total Score		83	87	87	78	76
Number of Students Tested		130	101	104	91	73
Percent of Total Students Tested		100	100	100	100	100
Number of Students Excluded		0	0	0	0	0
Percent of Students Excluded		0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1. White		87	94	93	85	78
Number of Students Tested		36	30	28	29	14
2. Black		79	79	73	67	71
Number of Students Tested		41	34	34	32	32
3. Hispanic		83	87	87	81	73
Number of Students Tested		38	32	37	22	23
4. Female		79	87	83	78	76
Number of Students Tested		77	64	66	55	49
5. Male		93	91	91	81	79
Number of Students Tested		53	37	38	36	24